



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/056,860	01/23/2002	Michael Petroff	1035/203	4881
26588	7590	01/25/2005	EXAMINER	
LIU & LIU 811 WEST SEVENTH STREET, SUITE 1100 LOS ANGELES, CA 90017			LE, HUYEN D	
			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			2643	

DATE MAILED: 01/25/2005

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary	Application No. 10/056,860	Applicant(s) PETROFF ET AL.	
	Examiner HUYEN D. LE	Art Unit 2643	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 20 September 2004.
- 2a) ☒ This action is FINAL. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-28 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☒ Claim(s) 20 and 27 is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-19, 21-26 and 28 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☒ The drawing(s) filed on 20 September 2004 is/are: a) ☒ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All- b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|--|---|
| 1) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152) |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____ | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ |

DETAILED ACTION

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

1. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

2. Claims 1-3, 5, 8, 11 and 16-18 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Saiki Shuji (JP 60043998).

Regarding claims 1-3, 5, 8, and 11, Shuji teaches a loudspeaker (figures 2 and 6) which comprises a back plate (13 or 16 and 23 or 26), a frame (11 or 16), a driver (14, 24) coupled to the frame, an enhancer (15), and a membrane (12, 22), wherein the membrane (12, 22) is coupled to the mouth of the enhancer (15), supported and maintained by the frame as claimed. As shown in the drawings, the membrane (12, 22) is a thin film membrane.

Regarding claims 16 and 18, Shuji shows the back plate (16, 26) which has a recess for receiving the driver (13, 14, 23, 24).

Regarding claim 17, Shuji shows a recess that is off-center as claimed (figure 6).

-
3. ~~Claims 1-3, 5, 8, 10, 11, 19 and 28 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Rojas (U.S. 4,232,204).~~

Regarding claims 1-3, 5, 8, 11, Rojas teaches a loudspeaker which comprises a back plate (7, 10, 11), a frame (1), a driver (6) coupled to the frame, an enhancer (3), and

Art Unit: 2643

a membrane (5), wherein the membrane (5) is coupled to the mouth of the enhancer (3), supported and maintained by the frame as claimed. It appears that the panel (5) is a thin film diaphragm as compared the thickness of the speaker box (1).

Regarding claim 10, Rojas shows the small holes that are provided on the membrane at locations near the frame (see the small holes in the foam 2).

Regarding claim 19, as broadly claimed, Rojas shows the apertures in the back plate (7, 10).

Regarding claim 28, Rojas shows a hole in the membrane (5) for receiving the mouth of the enhancer (3).

4. Claims 1 and 24-26 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Wada et al. (U.S. 4,477,699) or Goossens (U.S. patent 4,517,416).

Regarding claims 1 and 24-26, Wada or Goossens teaches a loudspeaker which comprises a back plate (1 in Wada, and 4 in Goossens), a frame (2 in Wada and 6 in Goossens), a driver (7 and 8 in Wada, 2 and 3 in Goossens) coupled to the frame, an enhancer (5, 11 in Wada and 21 in Goossens), and a thin film membrane (4 in Wada and 23, 24, 25 in Goossens), wherein the membrane is coupled to the mouth of the enhancer, supported and maintained by the frame as claimed.

Regarding claims 24-26, Wada or Goossens shows the claimp as claimed (6 in Wada and 30 in Goossens).

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

5. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

This application currently names joint inventors. In considering patentability of the claims under 35 U.S.C. 103(a), the examiner presumes that the subject matter of the various claims was commonly owned at the time any inventions covered therein were made absent any evidence to the contrary. Applicant is advised of the obligation under 37 CFR 1.56 to point out the inventor and invention dates of each claim that was not commonly owned at the time a later invention was made in order for the examiner to consider the applicability of 35 U.S.C. 103(c) and potential 35 U.S.C. 102(e), (f) or (g) prior art under 35 U.S.C. 103(a).

6. Claims 4, 6-7, 9, 12-15 and 21-23 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Saeki Shuji (JP 60043998).

Regarding claim 4, Shuji does not specifically teach the thickness as claimed. However, Shuji does estimate a small thickness for the speaker.

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one skilled in the art to provide any range of thickness for the speaker of Shuji such as the thickness of less than 30 mm for a thin speaker.

Regarding claims 6-7 and 9, Shuji does not specifically disclose the material as claimed in claims 6-7. However, it is known in the art to provide the material of the

Art Unit: 2643

diaphragm which is made of a flexible, substantially non-elastic, Kapton, polyimide or metal foil material.

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one skilled in the art to provide any material for the diaphragm (12) of Shuji such as the material which is made of a flexible, substantially non-elastic, Kapton, polyimide or metal foil material or the material which is uniformly tensioned strength of about 5 to 30 lbs of force for alternate choice depending on the desired frequency characteristics.

Regarding claim 12, Shuji does not teach the magnetic oil as claimed. However, providing the magnetic oil in the magnetic gap or driver of a magnetic circuit is very well known in the art.

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one skilled in the art to provide magnetic oil in the driver of the Shuji speaker for dampening resonance and vibrations from the diaphragm. This would provide the improved frequency characteristics.

Regarding claims 13-15, Shuji does not specifically disclose the ratios for the enhancer as claimed. However, Shuji does not restrict to any specific size for the enhancer (15).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one skilled in the art to provide any size for the enhancer such as the diameters of the neck and the mouth as claimed in claims 13-15 for greater flexibility depending on the desired frequency characteristics.

Regarding claims 21-22, Shuji does not specifically disclose the material as claimed in claims 21-22. However, it is known in the art to provide the material of the diaphragm which is made of a paper or Kevlar material.

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one skilled in the art to provide any material for the enhancer of Shuji such as the material which is made of a paper or Kevlar material for an alternate choice depending on the desired frequency characteristics.

Regarding claim 23, Shuji does not specifically disclose a rubber type adhesive for adhering the membrane to the enhancer or the frame. However, using a rubber adhesive for connecting the parts in a loudspeaker such as the diaphragm to the frame is known in the art.

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one skilled in the art to provide any adhesive material for connecting the membrane to the frame or the enhancer of the Shuji speaker such as the rubber adhesive for an alternate choice.

7. Claims 12 and 21-23 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Rojas (U.S. 4,232,204).

Regarding claim 12, Rojas does not teach the magnetic oil as claimed. However, providing the magnetic oil in the magnetic gap or driver of a magnetic circuit is very well known in the art.

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one skilled in the art to provide magnetic oil in the driver of the Roja speaker for dampening resonance and vibrations from the diaphragm. This would provide the improved frequency characteristics.

Regarding claims 21-22, Rojas does not specifically disclose the material as claimed in claims 21-22. However, it is known in the art to provide the material of the diaphragm which is made of a paper or Kevlar material.

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one skilled in the art to provide any material for the enhancer of Rojas such as the material which is made of a paper or Kevlar material for alternate choice depending on the desired frequency characteristics.

Regarding claim 23, Rojas does not specifically disclose a rubber type adhesive for adhering the membrane to the enhancer or the frame. However, using a rubber adhesive for connecting the parts in a loudspeaker such as the diaphragm to the frame is known in the art.

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one skilled in the art to provide any adhesive material for connecting the membrane to the frame or the enhancer of the Rojas speaker such as the rubber adhesive for alternate choice.

Allowable Subject Matter

8. Claims 20 and 27 have been allowed.

Response to Arguments

9. Applicant's arguments filed 09/20/04 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.

Responding to the arguments about the thin film membrane, the examiner refers to the Office Action. Since the Applicant does not specifically claim how the construction of the thin film membrane of the present invention is different from the constructions of the diaphragms or the membranes of Shuji, Rojas, Wada and Goosens, it appears that the diaphragm of Shuji, Rojas, Wada or Goosens is a thin film diaphragm (see the drawings).

Art Unit: 2643

Responding to the arguments about claims 6-7 and 9, the Applicant should note that providing different materials for the diaphragms depending on the desired frequency characteristics and the applications is well known in the art. Further, the diaphragm for a speaker made of flexible and substantially non-elastic material, polyimide material or a metal foil is very well known in the art. The Applicant could find these materials in any diaphragms for the speakers.

Conclusion

10. **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL.** Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire **THREE MONTHS** from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within **TWO MONTHS** of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the **THREE-MONTH** shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than **SIX MONTHS** from the mailing date of this final action.

11. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to HUYEN D. LE whose telephone number is (703) 305-4844. The examiner can normally be reached on 9:30AM-6:00PM.

Art Unit: 2643

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, CURTIS KUNTZ can be reached on (703) 305-4708. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).



HL
January 21, 2005



HUYEN LE
PRIMARY EXAMINER